



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,352	08/26/2003	Chan Griswold	IGT1P089/P-794	4182
22434	7590	06/11/2008		
BEYER WEAVER LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			EXAMINER WILLIAMS, ROSS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/11/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/649,352

**Applicant(s)**

GRISWOLD ET AL.

**Examiner**

ROSS A. WILLIAMS

**Art Unit**

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group 1, claims 1 - 41 in the reply filed on is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that all of the claims are directed to a method or apparatus including a gaming machine cocktail table and that the continued search and examination based upon this defining characteristic would not be burdensome given the state of the related gaming arts. This is not found persuasive because the separate groups of claims and inventions do not necessarily include all the features of each other. Specifically, not all the claims require features such as smart cards to update and communicate player information.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10, 13 – 15, 23 – 26, 28, 30 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sines et al (US 2003/0027632).**

**Claims 1, 23, 40 and 41:** Sines discloses a gaming table that comprises a cocktail table chassis (Sines Fig 1), at least two or more display screens that are mounted in the cocktail table chassis and facing in a generally upward fashion for viewing by two or more players seated at the cocktail table chassis (Sines FIG 1). Sines further discloses a master gaming controller connected to each of the two or more display screens in a manner that allows the master gaming controller to control games presented on each of the two or more display screen wherein the games can be games separately played or played together upon the player display screens (Sines Par 0090, 0091, Figs 24, 25).

**Claims 2:** Sines discloses that the cocktail table chassis comprises exactly 2 video display screens.

**Claims 3, 28:** Sines further discloses the gaming machines comprising touch screens that are overlaid on the display screens for receiving player selections associated with game play on the gaming screen (Sines par 0112).

**Claim 5, 30:** Sines discloses a player credit device that is mounted inside the game machine chassis (Sines Par 0098 – 0101).

**Claims 6:** Sines discloses a biometric identification device that is mounted in the cocktail table chassis (Sines par 0124 – 0125).

**Claim 7, 24, 25, and 26:** Sines discloses a cocktail table that comprises a transparent monolithic tabletop that overlays the gaming table and the player devices such as the player displays and the sensors such as the credit devices (Sines par 207, FIG 44).

**Claim 8:** Sines discloses a gaming table that comprises a cocktail table chassis (Sines Fig 1), at least two or more display screens that are mounted in the cocktail table chassis and facing in a generally upward fashion for viewing by two or more players seated at the cocktail table chassis (Sines FIG 1). Sines further discloses a master gaming controller connected to each of the two or more display screens in a manner that allows the master gaming controller to control games presented on each of the two or more display screen (Sines Par 0090, 0091, Figs 24, 25). Sines further discloses the gaming machines comprising touch screens that are overlaid on the display screens for receiving player selections associated with game play on the gaming screen (Sines par 0112). Sines discloses a wireless player credit device that is mounted inside the game machine chassis (Sines Par 0098 – 0101). Sines discloses a cocktail table that comprises a transparent monolithic tabletop that overlays the gaming table and the player devices such as the player displays and the sensors such as the credit devices (Sines par 207, FIG 44). All player interaction takes place through the monolithic tabletop.

**Claim 9:** Sines further discloses a master gaming controller connected to each of the two or more display screens in a manner that allows the master gaming controller to control games presented on each of the two or more display screen (Sines Par 0090, 0091, Figs 24, 25). The master game controller is inside the cocktail table chassis, and thus protected from contamination.

**Claim 10:** Sines discloses the monolithic tabletop is transparent (Sines Fig 44, par 02017).

**Claims 13, 33, 34, and 35:** Sines discloses biometric devices that are mounted under the monolithic tabletop (Sines par 0125, 0207).

**Claim 14:** Sines discloses at least 2 player displays that are mounted in an upward direction on the cocktail table chassis (Sines par 0009, 0091).

**Claim 15, 31, and 32:** Sines discloses a wireless credit device that is a smart card reader that is able to transmit and receive credit information (Sines Par 0123).

**Claims 36 – 39:** Sines disclose the use of sounds that is generated by the game machine speakers as well as lights that are used to present game (Sines par 0094, par 0247).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sines et al (US 2003/0027632).**

**Claim 11:** Sines discloses that the monolithic tabletop is made of a transparent material such as acrylic (Sines par 0207). However, Sines does not disclose that the material is made of glass or is of a ½ inch thick. However in light of the fact that Sines discloses that the monolithic tabletop can be made of a transparent material, the use of glass is an obvious choice of materials to use for the monolithic tabletop. It would be further be obvious to make the monolithic tabletop at least ½ inch thick to support the weight of player leaning on the tabletop. This would be beneficial to both the casinos and the player by protecting the gaming equipment and the ensuring the player's physical safety.

**Claims 4, 16 – 22 and 27 – 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sines et al (US 2003/0027632) in view of Minami (WO 02/099479 A2).**

**Claims 4, 16, 18, 27, 28, 29:** Sines discloses the gaming machine as disclosed above, Sines discloses a gaming table that comprises a cocktail table chassis (Sines Fig 1), at least two or more display screens that are mounted in the cocktail table chassis and facing in a generally upward fashion for viewing by two or more players seated at the cocktail table chassis (Sines FIG 1). Sines further discloses the gaming machines comprising touch screens that are overlaid on the display screens for receiving player selections associated with game play on the gaming screen (Sines par

0112). Sines discloses the use of covers and other types of shielding to hide the players screen from others at the table (Sines par 0126). Sines does not specifically disclose at least an image redirect sheet that is disposed on at least one of the player display screens. However, Minami discloses a louver film that is adhered to the surface of the liquid crystal display and it functions as an optical filter, which prevents unnecessary exit of light beams and guards against privacy (Minami page 3:22 - 28).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sines in view of Minami to provide an image redirect sheet upon the display screens to redirect light from the player display to the player. This would be beneficial to the player due to the fact that a player may not want to be positioned extremely close to the player display and would enable a player to have a sense of privacy when playing a game due to the fact that the display image can be directly displayed to the player and not displayed to others.

**Claim 17:** Sines discloses the display screen being LCD screens.

**Claim 19, 20:** Sines discloses the monolithic tabletop is transparent that overlays the game table and display screens thus protecting the table and devices from contamination (Sines Fig 44, par 02017).

**Claim 21:** Sines discloses a wireless player credit device that is mounted inside the game machine chassis (Sines Par 0098 – 0101).

**Claim 22:** Sines discloses biometric devices that are mounted under the monolithic tabletop (Sines par 0207).



***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROSS A. WILLIAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-5911. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ronald Laneau can be reached on (571) 272-6784. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. A. W./

Application/Control Number: 10/649,352

Page 9

Art Unit: 3714

Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Ronald Laneau/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714  
06/09/08